

REMARKS

This amendment responds to the final office action dated April 17, 2008.

The Examiner rejected claims 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. After reviewing claim 3, the applicant agrees that it is indefinite, but for a different reason than given by the Examiner. Claim 1 defines a current frame, at least one subsequent frame, and at least one previous frame. Claim 1 also defines at least one “predicted displayed luminance value” respectively associated with the at least one subsequent frame, and at least one “previously displayed luminance value” associated with the at least one previous frame. With respect to this latter claimed “at least one previously displayed luminance value”, claim 3 further defines a “first” previously displayed luminance value and a “second” previously displayed luminance value, which are each (by the plain terms of claim 1) associated with a respective previous frame to the current frame, and not a subsequent frame as hypothesized by the Examiner.

However, claim 3 also recited the limitation that the “said second said previously displayed luminance value is from the earliest sequential said at least one frame, upon which selection of said current value is based.” The use of the term “sequential” created an ambiguity as to whether the “earliest” frame is calculated backwards from the current frame (i.e. the used, previously displayed luminance value closest to the current frame) or forwards along the displayed frame sequence (i.e., the used, previously displayed luminance value furthers from the current frame). The latter is what is intended. The applicant has amended claim 3 to eliminate the term “sequential”, thereby overcoming the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Sekiya et al., U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2003/0006949. Independent claim 1, however, had previously been amended to recite the limitation of “overdriving at least one pixel of said image, for a current frame, to a current value that is selected based upon: (i) at least one predicted displayed luminance value of said pixel in respective ones of at least one subsequent frame of said image.” Sekiya clearly does not disclose this limitation. The Examiner argues that the cited reference discloses the limitation at paragraph [0056.]. That paragraph, however, clearly states that

“overdrive voltage calculating section 11 stores values for calculating an overdrive voltage to be applied *this time* based on the *present* capacitance value, wherein these values are obtained from simulation and used as reference data for interpolation.” (emphasis added). For any given current frame to be displayed (i.e. “this time”), the “present” capacitance value of a pixel is only a function of the previous target luminance values of the pixel. It is not possible for the capacitance of a pixel to depend on the displayed luminance at some point in the future. The cited reference goes on to disclose a “capacitance predicting section 12” that predicts the capacitance that will exist at the pixel one frame later after applying the previously selected overdrive voltage for the current frame.” It is these predicted capacitance values that are used in next subsequent frame as the “present” capacitance value. *See* Sekiya at par. [0050]. Therefore, the overdrive system of Sekiya selects an overdrive voltage for a current frame based solely on target luminance values for previous frames, and not on predicted displayed luminance values for any frame subsequent to the current frame.

Because claim 3, as amended, overcomes the Examiner’s rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, and because the cited reference Sekiya fails to disclose the limitations of claim 1 that were added in the applicant’s prior amendment, the application should be in a condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Kurt Rohlf
Reg. No. 54,405
Tel No.: (503) 227-5631